

NOV 11 1926

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, No. 4

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1926

WHOLE No. 534

"The newer tendencies in Latin teaching"

are embodied in

ELEMENTARY LATIN SECOND LATIN BOOK

Two-book course in Latin by

Ullman & Henry

IN THE preparation of this course careful consideration was given to the unpublished recommendations of the Committee on Classical Languages, appointed by the National Education Association, and to the Latin Syllabus for Secondary Schools, published by the University of the State of New York.

The Macmillan Company

NEW YORK BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO

THE LEWIS LATIN DICTIONARIES

Lewis's Elementary Latin Dictionary

New edition, By CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D. With an Appendix of Persons and Places, by HUGH MACMASTER KINGERY, Ph.D., Professor of Latin, Wabash College. 1033 pages. \$3.00.

THE NEW edition of this widely popular dictionary includes an Appendix of seventy-seven pages containing the names of persons and places met in the Latin authors commonly studied in the first two years of the College course.

Lewis's Latin Dictionary for Schools

By CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D. 1203 pages. \$5.00

EVERY word or phrase in the Latin literature commonly read in Schools is explained in this volume: the complete works of Caesar, Terence, Cicero, Livy, Nepos, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Phaedrus, and Curtius, the *Catiline* and *Jugurtha* of Sallust, the *Germania* and *Agricola* of Tacitus, and a few words found in some extracts from Florus, Eutropius, and Justinus. The original meaning of each word is given first, followed by the modifications.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA



The road to Rome will seem less long and less rough to the class which uses

MOORE'S CICERO

All the reading, grammar, and composition for the third year in one volume. Meeting the latest College Entrance Requirements, and the recommendations of the Classical Investigation.

GREENOUGH-KITTREDGE-JENKINS' VIRGIL

The first six books of the Aeneid, with extracts and summaries of Books VII-XII, and selections from Ovid's Metamorphoses. Ably Edited. Beautifully illustrated.

BOSTON
CHICAGOGINN AND COMPANY
ATLANTA DALLAS COLUMBUSNEW YORK
SAN FRANCISCO

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 4

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1926

WHOLE No. 534

THE PRESENT TREND IN VERGILIAN STUDIES¹

From the utter misconception of the Aeneid as a Roman imitation of the Iliad and the Odyssey we have been, in large part, delivered. No one any longer attempts to determine the relative greatness of the Greek poems and their Roman counterpart: they have long been recognized as belonging to different types of epic, and, therefore, as incapable of being measured by the same rod. Upon the recognition of this fact there followed a juster evaluation of the poetic achievement of Vergil: men came to realize that, finding in Homer a rich mine of suggestion, Vergil had worked this priceless ore into forms so Roman that they are, in reality, new creations.

This is not to ignore the presence in the Aeneid of countless lines and phrases which were taken over bodily from the Homeric poems. Such lines were stored away in the mind of a Roman poet as a recognized part of his technical equipment and came to his lips and flowed from his pen more naturally than we can imagine in these days of many books and of weak verbal memories. But in the case of the more extended borrowings, i. e. in the adaptation of whole episodes, not only do they show that Vergil was no mere imitator, but they are precisely the points at which his originality is often best discovered. Read the Katabasis of Odysseus (Odyssey II), then read Aeneid 6, and what is your chief impression? Certainly, it is not an impression of their resemblances so much as of their differences. How wide apart the two accounts stand in subject-matter and in technique! How far the speculative thought of man has travelled in the intervening centuries! With what dignity and impressiveness, here at least, has conscious art taken the place of naïveté in narration! After Norden and Heinze and Warde Fowler no one need defend the originality of Vergil. For some time yet we shall doubtless go on in the path to which these scholars have pointed us, discovering fresh illustrations of Voltaire's epigrammatic judgment, 'If Homer is the creator of Vergil, Vergil is certainly the finest of his works'.

It is a commonplace of literary criticism that, while a distant background is essential to a heroic poem, the epic, to endure, must also arise out of the conditions of its own time and then must reach out and on into all time. That the Aeneid had such a vital connection with the political problems of its own age is an obvious and sufficiently familiar fact. It was an answer to the cry of a world exhausted by decades of bloody warfare, a world which, as we see in the literature of the time,

longed for nothing so much as for peace². The dreary years of conflict, ended at last by the decisive victory of Actium, had greatly quickened at Rome the sense of national life³. Upon the poets was dawning the vision of Rome's great mission to subdue and govern the world, but it was Vergil who first caught and immortalized the vision. In order to make so bold a conception plausible he sets forth the divine origin of Rome, reaching far back into a prehistoric past, with the will of heaven at work for centuries, slowly moulding human events to this great and beneficent consummation.

But the vital connection of the Aeneid with its own day is evidenced not only by its strong national *motif*; under the leadership of men like Glover⁴ and Mayor⁵ and Conway⁶ we have come to realize how rich a testimony it bears to the cultural conditions of the age. What a flood of light it throws on the state of religious and philosophic thought at the beginning of the Christian era! What interesting questions in social ethics it raises and then judges with truly prophetic insight! How startlingly advanced for that day is Vergil's conception of the brutality of war and of the supremacy of the arts and the virtues of peace! Because he gathered up ancient rites and traditions into one organic body with the thought of his own time and with the noblest aspirations for the future, his poems have been fittingly characterized as 'lying at the watershed of religion'⁷. On the whole, we may look back with no little gratitude and pride on the last half-century in Vergilian studies, because it has reinterpreted to the world a great poem, the position of which in the history of human thought will always be significant.

We have already entered upon a somewhat new stage of our studies, a stage which is, however, but the logical result of the steps which I have just briefly reviewed. We are pushing further the question of Vergil's originality. From what sources did he compose his

²Compare a paper entitled The Messianic Idea in Virgil, by R. S. Conway, which covers pages 11-48 of a volume called Virgil's Messianic Eclogue, by R. S. Conway, W. Warde Fowler, and J. B. Mayor (London, John Murray, 1907). See here especially pages 31-38.

³Compare W. Y. Sellar, Virgil², 297 (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1883).

⁴See T. R. Glover, Virgil² (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1912). The third and the fourth editions of this book show no changes from the second).

⁵See footnote 2.

⁶See footnote 2, and a paper entitled The Place of Dido in the History of Europe, published originally in The Quarterly Review, July, 1920. The paper was republished as Chapter VII, pages 140-164 of a book, New Studies of a Great Inheritance, by R. S. Conway (London, John Murray, 1921). For a review of the book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.210-211).

⁷F. W. H. Myers, Essays Classical, 165 (London, Macmillan and Company, 1883). The passage occurs in an essay entitled Virgil (106-176). It is to be found also in Mr. Myers's later volume, Essays Classical and Modern (London, Macmillan and Company, 1921. See pages 106-176. For a review of the latter book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.53-54).

¹This paper was read at the Seventh Annual Fall Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Barnard College, November 28, 1925.

picture of the heroic age in Italy? Is it largely imaginative, based on suggestions from Homer? Or does the Aeneid deal with a real Italy and does it bear evidence that Vergil had some notion of that prehistoric period which Roman archaeologists have been reconstructing for us, notably in the last decade? Everything that we know of Vergil's method would lead us to expect from him the most painstaking effort to produce a true and consistent picture. This expectation seems to be confirmed by the few serious studies which have so far been made in this direction.

One of the most detailed of these investigations was published in 1919 by Jérôme Carcopino, who, before the Great War, had been a student at the French School at Rome. His book⁸ is an elaborate study of ancient Ostia with particular reference to Vergil. Aeneid in hand, he went over all the coast-region from Ostia down to Prattica and Ardea, reconstructing the setting of the events recorded in the last six books of the poem: Aeneas's first settlement at the mouth of the Tiber, where now ruined Ostia lies⁹; the forest in which Silvia's pet stag roamed, where now Victor Emmanuel III hunts the wild boar¹⁰; a little to the north, the knoll from which Nisus and Euryalus, on their hunting expeditions, had seen the outskirts of Evander's city and where to-day the traveller coming up from Ostia suddenly gets a breath-taking view of all Rome¹¹; the coronation-hall of Latinus on the hill where now stands a château of the Borghese family¹², commanding a view of sea and plain for many miles; perhaps an hour's walk distant, the grotto where Latinus communed by night with the spirit of his ancestor, Faunus, to-day the sulphurous springs of the Zolforata¹³. Of the dense surrounding forest only a few lonely pines remain, but the odorous waters, with their explosive gases, still suggest a connection with the lower world.

To this topographical study of the Aeneid Dr. W. Warde Fowler indirectly contributed in two of his well-known monographs¹⁴. There he showed from what a store of antiquarian knowledge Vergil drew to make that stirring, colorful pageant in Book 7.647-817 out of what might easily have been a dreary list of undifferentiated troops; and, again, how the poet of the Augustan Age could think away from the stately Palatine temple and library and palace and make his readers see just as vividly the straw-thatched huts of Evander's settlement, from which one looked across to the mysterious, wooded Capitoline, and down upon the lowing cattle in the Forum Valley.

When Vergil chose to put the main action of his epic only a few miles from Rome, it became necessary for him to draw a true picture of a region so well known to all his readers: nothing less would have been tolerated.

Into this carefully studied setting a man of his learning and marked antiquarian interests would have spared no pains to put a *Kultur* that was consistently drawn.

What knowledge of primitive Italy, whether traditional or archaeological, was available to the Augustan scholar? In the field of books we have to lament the loss of almost all this material which Vergil knew—notably, the early portions of Cato's *Origines*, and Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum*. Much traditional matter of this sort has come down to us from later writers, e. g. Servius and Macrobius, and has already been the subject of no little study. The new task before us now is to compare with the material civilization which Vergil pictures the remains of prehistoric Italy which are being gathered into great museums, from the cemeteries of the Alban Hills and the Forum Valley, from the Iron Age tombs of the Esquiline, from the excavations now in progress at Volscian Antium, and from the rich chamber-tombs of Etruria. Indeed, the list of sources might be indefinitely extended to include the various regions inhabited by all the peoples who flocked to the standard of Turnus or came to the aid of Aeneas.

As we read the two catalogues in the light of prehistoric studies, certain very obvious questions arise in our minds. Thus we may ask, Did Vergil recognize any distinction between the cremating and the inhuming peoples involved in the great struggle? He would probably infer from Homer that the Trojans and Evander's Arcadians practised cremation. He could hardly have been ignorant of the rich Etruscan tombs that lay within easy reach of Rome, and he probably had observed that the Etruscans of his own day buried their dead; but as regards the followers of Turnus the poet might easily have been mistaken, since cremation was the custom of his day throughout Central Italy, and probably only the chance discovery of old tombs could have suggested to the learned that in primitive times the area of cremation was limited to the central part of Latium, whereas the Rutuli of Turnus's Ardea and the Volscians of the Pontine region generally practised inhumation. As a matter of fact, examination of the Aeneid shows that "Vergil was remarkably consistent in recognizing differences in primitive burial-customs; that he thought of Trojans and Arcadians as practising cremation but that he regarded the south Etruscans and the great bulk of the Latin allies as inhuming peoples"¹⁵.

In the last six books, where, to quote Conington's paraphrase of Macrobius, the Iliad of war succeeds the Odyssey of travel, the question of military equipment forms an interesting line of approach to our general subject. Does Vergil merely appropriate the weapons of the Iliad, or may the arms which his native peoples carry be paralleled from the existing remains of prehistoric Italy?

To the native troops he has assigned all the kinds of weapons which he has given to Aeneas's men; but there are, in addition, among the Latins many instances of a

⁸*Virgile et les Origines d'Ostie* (Paris, E. de Boccard, 1919). For a review of this book, by Professor Lily Ross Taylor, of Vassar College, see *American Journal of Philology* 41 (1920), 396-400.

⁹Carcopino, 391-557.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 259, n. 4.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 324, n. 2.

¹²*Ibid.*, 330.

¹³*Ibid.*, 341-344.

¹⁴Vergil's "Gathering of the Clans"¹, and Aeneas at the Site of Rome² (Oxford, Blackwell, 1918, 1918). For a review of the latter book see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 13.197-198).

¹⁵The above summary of burial-customs in the Aeneid is taken almost verbatim from my paper, *Cremation and Inhumation in the Aeneid*, *American Journal of Philology* 46 (1925), 352-357.

more primitive and more unusual equipment. For example, they have shields with wicker frame-work (7.632; compare Servius's note on the passage); one of their leaders has for a helmet a lion's head (7.666); some of Caeculus's men wear tawny *galeri* of wolf skin (7.688); the Campanians have helmets of cork-bark, though their swords and their shields are of bronze (7.442-443). Caeculus's slingers and spearmen have the left foot bare and the right foot shod with the *crudus pero* (7.690)¹⁶. Clubs, stakes, and poles are used by the Latins much more than by Aeneas's men. On the Latin side alone we find the *teretes aclydes*, the *ceitra*, and the *falcati enses* (7.730-732; compare Servius's notes), the *cateia* (7.741; compare Servius's notes), the *pilum*, the *dolo* and the *veru Sabellum* (7.664-665; compare Servius's notes), the *falarica* (9.705). When the axe is used as a weapon, it is wielded by Turnus's men; when the brutal act is described, the warrior is pictured as splitting the skull of his adversary. The sling with lead bullets is found only on the Latin side. In appraising all this evidence one must, however, remember that the catalogue of Aeneas's forces makes slight mention of equipment, whereas the poet has elaborated the Latin catalogue until it presents a great pageant.

The prominence of iron weapons in the Aeneid is in marked contrast with the rare use of this metal in the Homeric Poems, but it agrees admirably with the contents of primitive warrior-tombs in Italy. The striking amount of gold in the Latin equipment is not at all borne out by the simple contents of Latian tombs, but it is abundantly confirmed by such splendid Etruscan tombs as the Regolini-Galassi and the Bernardini. Mr. Warde Fowler remarks¹⁷ that Vergil seemed to be conscious of a Bronze Age in Italy. This is putting the case mildly; for, apart from several individual instances of bronze arms, the squadrons of Camilla 'bloom with bronze' (11.433), the lines of Messapus are bronze-clad (7.703), and Oebalus's Oscan contingent flashes in shields and swords of bronze (7.742-743).

Upon any real discussion of the specific weapons¹⁸ time forbids us to enter here, but a few remarks in passing may show something of the nature of the problem. The iron spear-point, so frequently mentioned in the Aeneid, is very common in Italic and Etruscan burials. The same statement holds true of Vergil's iron and bronze battle-axes. His swords, with their elaborate sheaths and pommels, are more than matched from these tombs. Parallel with his bronze *clipeus* is the round bronze shield which is so characteristic of the warrior-tombs of Etruria. The types of helmets found in Italic tombs are even more numerous than Vergil suggests. The subject is further illumined by examples from architectural terra-cottas of the late sixth or the early fifth century.

In this brief paper I have tried to show how students

of Vergil are coming to appreciate the reality of the Italy which he pictured. My illustrations have all been drawn from the Aeneid and from a remote period in the life of Italy; but the same thing might have been shown from the other works of Vergil and for the Italy of his day, as Professor Mackail suggested in one of his characteristically charming papers¹⁹. I cannot better recapitulate my own presentation of this whole case than by quoting the opinion which he then expressed on the new trend in Vergilian studies (1-2):

Half a century ago a commentator on Virgil was content to treat the whole thing as a matter of book-learning: to discuss his text, to comment on his grammar, vocabulary, and metric, to enumerate his real or fancied borrowings from earlier poets, Greek or Latin, and to add remarks on his epic technique, his philosophy, or his psychological insight. Anyone approaching the same task now would have to do so with a much larger scope and a vastly larger equipment. He would have to bring to it the whole armament of Roman studies, to recreate, so far as may be, through knowledge and imagination, the Rome and the Italy of Virgil's own time and also of those earlier times of which Virgil was so profound a student. The archaeological study, if one may so call it, of poetry is not without its dangers and its temporary drawbacks. The Homeric question, for instance, . . . has to some extent obscured Homer, has diverted attention from the poetical greatness of the Iliad and the Odyssey; but in the end it is bringing an appreciation of that greatness, deepened and enlarged by the further appreciation of the relation in which it stands to a whole civilisation and history. So, too, with Virgil. Admiration of his poetical genius is only heightened by the fuller knowledge we are gaining of him as the voice and interpreter of the Latin civilisation in all its aspects. We no longer study him as mere literature; or, rather, literature with him as with others has grown into a new meaning. It is not a picture drawn and colored on the flat, but an organic solid, attached everywhere to a three-dimensional world. At every point Virgil's work throws light on Roman studies and has light thrown on it by them. The beautiful pattern with which we have long been familiar becomes stereoscopic; the polished, reflecting surface becomes translucent. We see deep into its structure and have always the hope of seeing deeper; we can trace layers of growth; here and there we can watch the poetry coming into existence. And, as we do so, point after point kindles into new meaning because it is seen in organic relation to an actual world.

VASSAR COLLEGE

CATHARINE SAUNDERS

PLATO'S EUTHYDEMUS AND LYSIAS

In the Euthydemus, Plato is using the methods of Aristophanes, combined, of course, with a serious purpose of his own¹. He is caricaturing some contemporary programme of education in rhetoric. The fallacies of the Euthydemus are absurd applications of an erroneous logical method employed seriously by the historical Euthydemus, of whom we know that he is not a fiction, from Aristotle's mention of him (Sophistici Elenchi 20, 177 b, 12; Rhetorica 2.24 = 1401 a 27). The final *reductio ad absurdum* of the method is the

¹⁹Virgil and Roman Studies, in Journal of Roman Studies 3 (1913), 1-24.

²⁰For this view see Benjamin Jowett, The Dialogues of Plato, 194, and W. C. Greene, The Spirit of Comedy in Plato, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 31 (1920), 63-123, especially 79-81.

¹⁶On the reason for this see W. Warde Fowler, Virgil's "Gathering of the Clans", 60-61.

¹⁷Ibid., 71.

¹⁸A detailed account of the weapons mentioned in the Aeneid will ultimately be included in a larger study of the heroic setting of the poem on which I am working.

use of it to prove (293,294) that everyone knows everything, and that, therefore, all education is superfluous.

While the fallacies supplied by Plato are caricatures of those of Euthydemus, it does not follow that the picture of Euthydemus given by Plato is like enough to the original to pass even as a caricature. Aristophanes's pictures of Socrates and Euripides are the broadest burlesque, not recognizable caricatures at all. Socrates did not habitually perch in a basket, nor was Euripides wont to use the *eccyclema* as a convenient method of admitting visitors to his company. Plato's burlesque is not, as a rule, so broad as that of the comic poet. Still, it is quite improbable that Hippias, Thrasymachus, and others behaved in real life as they do in Plato's dialogues. Plato's methods, if used to-day, would be considered scurrilous and vulgar, though the eighteenth century could stomach that sort of thing; witness the *Dunciad*. Hence it is not necessary to suppose that the Sophists were vile, because Plato so represents them. When we read Demosthenes's invective against Aeschines, we make allowance for the license permitted to controversialists. The same allowance must be made in the case of Plato, who not only vilified his opponents rather cleverly in his writings, but, if we may judge by the statements of Diogenes Laertius, treated some of them in real life like an aristocratic snob. They of course retaliated according to ancient Greek standards of conduct. The fallacy of supposing that Plato was too much the *modern* aristocrat to vilify his opponents unless they were vile is an old one, but still extant. It may be said in passing that those writings of Plato which contain biting Aristophanic attacks on opponents are plausibly assigned to that period of his life which preceded his first visit to Sicily, from which he returned at the age of forty. Possible exceptions are the *Euthydemus* and the first book of the *Republic*, which are the worst of all from the point of view of modern standards. Quite possibly they also are early.

These preliminary remarks about Plato's controversial methods are intended to pave the way for the identification of the brothers Dionysodorus and Euthydemus of Plato's *Euthydemus* with the historical Lysias and his brother Euthydemus, who are mentioned together in *Republic* I (328 B). If we once admit the possibility that Plato could treat Lysias as Aristophanes treats Socrates and Euripides, the demonstration of the identity of Lysias and Dionysodorus becomes not only possible, but convincing. Plato in his youth was a clever, bitterly satirical critic of the teachers of his time. He is not even greatly concerned to be accurate. Witness his statement in the *Gorgias* that Gorgias professed to teach virtue (460 A), which he later retracts in the *Meno* (95 C).

Unless we are to shrink from the very idea of Plato burlesquing Lysias, we must admit that in the *Euthydemus* Plato has indicated Lysias as plainly as he can without mentioning him by name. Lysias's political influence may have made such mention unsafe or unwise. The brothers—Euthydemus and Dionysodorus—are said (271 C) to have been exiled from Thurii

and to have lived in the neighborhood of Athens for many years. They took up the art of disputation in their old age (272 B) and wrote speeches for the law-courts (272 A). This corresponds with the known facts of Lysias's life. The fact that he and Euthydemus are present in the *Republic* (328 B) in a company of people interested in rhetoric suggests that Lysias's brother was also a teacher of some sort. The Clitophon of the *Republic* was probably a pupil of Thrasymachus; Charmantides of Paeania was an early pupil of Isocrates. It is hardly likely, though possible, that others besides Lysias may have been exiled from Thurii after the failure of the Athenian expedition against Syracuse and may also have taken up the practice of rhetoric at Athens in their old age; the possibility almost vanishes if we stipulate a brother Euthydemus. It is hardly a valid objection to the proposed identification that the brothers are described as Chians. The references (271 C; 288 B) are in any case vague. That their claim to be Chians is only a joke Plato shows later when he derides their ignorance of the fact that the Ionians have not Zeus, but Apollo, as *πατριῶς* (302 C).

But the brothers in the *Euthydemus* were pancratiasts versed in hoplite fighting and capable of giving instruction in strategy and tactics. That was not true of Lysias—nor, it is safe to say, of any other rhetorician or sophist of any account. The strategy, tactics, and hoplite fighting are probably an elaborate joke in the same class with Socrates's basket. This is made to seem extremely likely by the repetition and elaboration of the references to hoplite fighting (272 A; 273 C; 273 E). They are not an incidental statement of fact, but an integral part of the comic argument. To take them seriously is to suppose that Plato was wasting his ammunition on very small fry indeed. Taken in connection with the shield-factory with which Lysias was occupied up to the time of his flight from Athens under The Thirty, the references become obvious and purposeful. The argument, which is set forth with quite Aristophanic zest, is as follows. Lysias formerly manufactured shields and put them into men's hands; now he manufactures speeches to put into their mouths; the use of his speeches makes men competent advocates and statesmen: *ergo*, the arms he gave them must have made them competent fighters and generals. If to manufacture speeches is to give instruction in oratory, then to manufacture shields is to give instruction in hoplite fighting and in strategy. Lysias presumably no more pretended to teach virtue than did Gorgias. It suited Plato's humor, however, to deride them both on the assumption that any teacher must *ipso facto* be trying and claiming to teach virtue. This is rather unfair, but Plato's enthusiasm for his ideal made any shortcomings of others seem correspondingly despicable.

The attempt to interpret the *Euthydemus* as a satire against Lysias and a brother of his engaged in teaching rhetoric makes it necessary to reconstruct from certain hints in the dialogue the circumstances of its composition. One of the Sophists is a new arrival in Athens (297 C, 5); this must be Euthydemus. He had

probably, like Isocrates, taught at Chios before coming to Athens, and this would account for the description of the brothers as Chians. It is not impossible, to be sure, that Lysias and his brother may have been residents of Chios before they went to Thurii. Our information about Lysias's early life is decidedly meager. Socrates's surprise at hearing that the brothers are educators as well as writers of speeches (273 D) suggests that Euthydemus had recently in a speech or in a treatise dealt with the art of rhetoric. We know from the Aristotelian references that Euthydemus's arguments were plausible fallacies involving equivocation in the meaning of words. This is the sort of fallacy that Plato so freely burlesques in the Euthydemus. From Plato we also learn that the Sophists supplied arguments to fit both sides of each case, as did all earlier and later teachers of oratory. The word used to describe their system, *ἐξαμφοτερίζειν* (300 D), is evidently quoted from them. The stay of Euthydemus in Athens may well have been brief. It is notable that more respect is shown in the dialogue to Dionysodorus than to his brother. There is a distinctly friendly tone in certain passages (284 E, 285 D, 293 E). The Euthydemus, for all its cutting wit, is not necessarily an ill-humored attack. Lysias wrote a defense of Socrates, and in the Republic Plato pays homage to Lysias's father. The banter of the Euthydemus need not have caused lasting ill-will in an age when such banter was a matter of course.

It should be noted that the characters of the Euthydemus are all historical. Crito and Clinias are well known. The latter was not, as Jowett states, the grandson, but the cousin, of the Alcibiades who died in 404. Ctesippus of Paeania is vouched for by the mention of him in the Phaedo (59 B) and in the Lysis (203 A). Aristotle's references to Euthydemus have been cited. The Dionysodorus of Xenophon (Memorabilia 3.1) is probably derived from Plato's dialogue. Dionysodorus in the Euthydemus represents an historical person, who is almost certainly the orator Lysias.

Jowett's suggestion that Lysias is referred to in the sequel (304 D) is unacceptable because of the statement that the critic in question was no orator (305 C). If the reference there is to anyone, it is to Isocrates, whom the description exactly fits, if we assign the Euthydemus to a date about the year 395 B. C. Lysias and Isocrates are criticized by name in the Phaedrus. It is natural that they should have been chosen for special criticism in an earlier work at a time when they were already the leading speech-writers of Athens.

There are many considerations that lead to the conclusion that the Euthydemus belongs among Plato's early works. Its tone of burlesque has been mentioned. The attack on rhetoric puts it with the Hippias Major, the Gorgias, and the first book of the Republic. It seems to be implied in Socrates's defense of political activity along with philosophy (306 C) that Plato was yet to renounce all part in Athenian politics as he did in the Gorgias. Socrates's protreptic discourses with Clinias in the Euthydemus are of a piece with the similar discourses of the Charmides and the Lysis.

Furthermore, in the testimonial to Socratic education that forms the conclusion of the Euthydemus we have a parallel to similar advertisements at the end of the Charmides and of the Laches as well as to the whole tendency of the Protagoras. Plato could already count on a group of students before he established the Academy. It was during the previous decade that he was obliged to herald the educational ideals that he inherited from Socrates.

The statement that the brothers began their rhetorical activity in old age is a strong confirmation, if the identification of Lysias and Dionysodorus is accepted, of the traditional dates (458-378 B. C.) of Lysias's life².

Haverford College
Haverford, Pa.

L. A. Post

REVIEWS

The Life of the Ancient East, Being Some Chapters of the Romance of Modern Excavation. By James Baikie. New York: The Macmillan Company (1923). Pp. xiv + 463.

Ancient Crete, The Sea-King's Eyrie. By James Baikie. London: A. and C. Black, Ltd. (1924). Pp. 96.

Mr. James Baikie is serving archaeology well by presenting the results of scholarship in a popularly attractive way. In *The Life of the Ancient East* he describes the discoveries of a score of leading archaeologists, so that Schliemann and Evans, Davis and Carter, Layard and George Smith become vivid witnesses to the truth of his statement (18) that

... there is no man who has so helped to put flesh and blood upon the dry bones of antiquity, and to breathe the breath of life into its nostrils, as the excavator with his spade and basket, his sieve and his paraffin-wax, and his inexhaustible patience in the pursuit of the very smallest detail which can add to man's knowledge of the days of old.

The contents of the book are as follows:

I. Introductory—The Work and the Methods (1-18); II. Abydos, The Holy City of Egypt, and the Dawn of History (19-48); III. Tell-El-Amarna; False Dawn (49-82); IV. Thebes, The City of Temples and Tombs—East Bank (83-109); V. Thebes, The City of Temples and Tombs—West Bank (110-152); VI. Tutankhamen in All his Glory (153-182); VII. Lagash, The Typical City-State of Early Babylonia (183-224); VIII. Babylon, The Fountain of Law (225-260); IX. Nineveh, and its Robber-Kings (261-307); X. Troy, The City of Romance (308-325); XI. Mycenae, and the Fortress-Palaces of Greece (326-366); XII. Knossos, The Home of the Sea-Kings of the Aegean (367-409); XIII. Gezer, A Home of Many Races (410-448); Bibliography (449-451); Index (453-463).

In each chapter there is a skilful blending of the story of discovery, a description of the finds, and an historic reconstruction to show the life of people as revealed by the excavations. Mr. Baikie describes the Passion Play of Osiris (23-25), the first known drama in the world, and tells the story of Akhenaten (Amen-hotep), as notable for his religious sensitiveness and

²Reference may be made to a paper entitled *The Euthydemus*, by Professor John B. Edwards, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* II.210-213, 217-220. C. K.

artistic modernism as for his political and military impotence (50-82), "the world's first idealist and the world's first *individual*" (so Professor J. H. Breasted, cited on page 81). He describes Karnak (98), "...the hugest ruin in the world... St. Peter's, Rome, Milan, and Notre Dame, Paris, are three of the most familiar and imposing of European cathedrals—the whole three put together just about equal in area the actual temple building of Karnak..."; the exciting opening of the tomb of Yuaa and his wife Tuau, by Theodore M. Davis (136-138), and that of Tutankhamen (155-161: the account must, of course, be revised in a later edition); the little wars and daily doings of Lagash (183-224), the prototype of the Athenian city-state, flourishing in Babylon in 3000 B. C.; the great code of law formulated by Hammurabi in Babylon near the end of the third millennium B. C., wherein penalties often were graduated in severity, increasing according to the social prominence of the offender; Nineveh, with its single century of existence, but that one of perhaps the most outrageous cruelty the world has ever seen; Gezer, a humble town between Jaffa and Jerusalem, with its record alike of child-sacrifice and of the chivalry of Simon Maccabaeus. Mr. Baikie explains why Palestine has been so disappointing to the excavator, giving as one reason the fact that "The Philistines... were the only cultured or artistic race who ever occupied the soil of Palestine, at least until the time when the influence of classical Greece asserted itself too strongly to be withstood..." (so R. A. S. Macalister, quoted on pages 412-413).

These Philistines, it is a fair conclusion, came from Crete. It is in his account of archaeological research in this and other Greek lands that Mr. Baikie will especially interest classical students, already familiar with the author's popular book *The Sea-Kings of Crete* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.158-159). The story of the rediscovery of Troy is told, with perhaps too much attention to Schliemann's romanticism and too little to Dörpfeld's scholarship. The general reader will learn with a shock that 'windy Troy' was smaller in area than the Athenian Acropolis; but, as Mr. Baikie says, the greatness of a city is measured (325) "by the heroism of the men and women who made and fought for it, and of the deeds which were done within and around it. Judged by that standard, Troy's greatness is unquestioned and secure..." The author's reconstruction of Mycenae is especially vivid; his description of those days of piracy and plunder recalls Mistral's spirited epic of the robber-princes of a medieval Mycenae, *Les Baux in Provence*, with its "raço d'eigloun, jamais vassalo". The account of life at Knossos is equally exciting, with this pungent summary (390-391):

...Altogether the impression left upon the mind by the relics of Minoan art is that of a people of astonishing mental agility, extraordinarily alert and sensitive to original ideas, and sometimes overflowing, in the very fullness of its life, into the crudity and gaudiness which not uncommonly characterize an art which is superabundant in strength, but has not yet learned how to curb its energy.

Much of the charm of the book resides in the quotations from the journals of excavators themselves. These include extracts from the priceless Belzoni ("One imagines Mr. Belzoni", says the author [90], "in the Egyptian Underworld, forever pursued by the ghosts of the indignant Egyptians on whose bodies he had sat, and the wrathful Egyptologists of a later age whose success he had fatally discounted..."), from Schliemann, from Layard's description of finding the Assyrian human-headed lion, and from many other chapters of exciting romance. Mr. Baikie's own descriptions are concise and colorful, and his criticism of the finds from an artistic point of view is happily restrained. He at times errs in taste. So, for instance, he coins the verb "extra-illustrated", speaks of objects as "staggeringly modern", and pictures the figures of Isis and Nephthys in the tomb of Tutankhamen in this maudlin fashion (161): "... their lovely faces were turned with a pathetic expression of reproach towards the intruders who had broken the solitude of thirty-three centuries". He might have chosen a better translation of the *Iliad* (94).

The 32 plates are, for the most part, excellently chosen.

Ancient Crete, *The Sea-King's Eyrie*, tells for children the romantic story of Greek archaeology. It includes Schliemann's discoveries as well as those in Crete, and, in its picturesque and spirited way, contains a quite amazing amount of information. The illustrations, however, are far from adequate. There are only eight half-tones, and the four colored drawings, modern versions of mythological scenes, are atrocious both in color and in design. Why could not photographs of the actual vases and frescoes have been included? Any intelligent child would prefer the Bull-baiting Girl in the Ashmolean Museum to the grotesque Medea in her Griffin Chariot here pictured.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, ANNAPOLIS

WALTER R. AGARD

The Writers of Greece. By Gilbert Norwood. The World's Manuals Series. Oxford University Press (1925). Pp. 144. \$1.00.

Mr. Gilbert Norwood's book, *The Writers of Greece*, a brief sketch of Greek literature, is a new volume in the Series called *The World's Manuals*. These books are designed, as we are told in an advertisement at the back of this volume,

...not only to give the student who is undertaking a special study some idea of the landmarks which will guide him, but to make provision for the great body of general readers who are sufficiently alive to the value of reading to welcome authoritative and scholarly work if it is presented to them in terms of its human interest and in a simple style and moderate compass....

In this series several volumes of interest to students of the Classics have already appeared, e. g. *Ancient Greece*, by Stanley Casson, *The Growth of Rome*, by P. E. Matheson, *Roman Britain*, by R. G. Collingwood (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.94-95), *Greek Art and Architecture*, by Percy Gardner and Sir Reginald Blomfield, *Greek Philosophy*, by M. E. J. Taylor, *The*

Genius of the Greek Drama: Three Plays, by C. E. Robinson, The Writers of Rome, by J. Wight Duff (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.37-38), Greek Biology and Greek Medicine, by Charles Singer.

It is no easy task to give an intelligible account of such a vast subject as Greek literature within the limits of 142 small pages. Some sceptics would say, I fear, that it can not be done—why, then, attempt it?

Let us see how Mr. Norwood attacks his task. Fourteen authors he chooses for separate and special discussion, as follows: Homer (15 pages), Sappho (2 pages), Pindar (5 pages), Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes (10 pages to each), Plato (16 pages), Aristotle (13 pages), Herodotus (7 pages), Thucydides (8 pages), and, finally, Xenophon, Demosthenes, and Theocritus (several pages to each).

All writers not included in this small group—and those left outside are disconcertingly numerous—are bundled into an introductory outline of some fifteen pages. These unfortunates inevitably are summarily dismissed in few words. Hence the reader obtains little information concerning their real nature, importance, and influence, and the extent of their work that survives. Some (e. g. Lysias) are not even mentioned.

I am inclined to believe that so extensive and important a subject as Greek literature should either be presented in a brief essay, lecture, or outline, with references to adequate discussions of the authors and the works mentioned, or else it should receive its just due in a volume of at least several hundred pages. Any treatment that falls between these limits is necessarily unsatisfactory.

In the limits set, however, Mr. Norwood has done his work well and in scholarly fashion. As one might expect from the author of an excellent book on Greek tragedy (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.131-133), the sketches of the dramatists are good. It is a pleasure also to read the sympathetic and just estimate of Pindar's genius. Some of Mr. Norwood's compatriots should read and profit by this little chapter. The discussion of Theocritus is not so good.

The Unitarians will grieve over the author's unregenerate views of Homer. Mr. Norwood seems to believe (21) that an Iliad was composed something like a thousand years before Christ; "its bulk", he thinks, "was afterwards increased by episodes not vitally connected with the original theme". Later, an Odyssey came into existence, and was enlarged by other narratives. That these epics are growths of two different epochs the author regards as certain for reasons that seem to the reviewer quite unconvincing (22-23). Some of the arguments are as follows: the authority of the Alexandrian Separatists; throughout the Iliad we move in a glorious present, whereas the Odyssey is pervaded by a reflective air; the tone regarding bloodshed is not the same in the two poems; magic, almost unknown in the Iliad, is a marked element in the Odyssey; the Iliad is pervaded by a sense of the mightiness of passion, the Odyssey by a sense of moral values. These seem feeble weapons indeed to bring against the wall of essential Homeric unity. The differences mentioned are natural in two poems of such different

aims: the Iliad, a poem full of Wrath and Ares, the Odyssey, a *Nostos*.

I add comments on a few minor matters.

Page 9.—"Alcman <was> a Spartan". Is this true in the light of Alcman, Frag. 24?

Page 12.—"The Old Comedy was marked by political satire..." says Mr. Norwood. Surely *personal* satire should be added.

Page 19.—"Lucian... is amazingly able, witty, and facile, in some way resembling brilliant Jewish writers of our own time, such as Mr. Beerbohm". Is this comparison felicitous?

Page 65.—Are we absolutely certain that Euripides "...wrote much of his work in a cave on Salamis"? Browning, of course, gives the tradition:

Soon the jeers grew: cold hater of his kind,
A sea cave suits him, not the vulgar hearth!

Page 83.—"...Aristophanes is one of the most indecent writers in the world". This is true, but is not some explanation or qualification needed here?

A number of well-chosen illustrations, some of unusual interest, give life to the text. The first picture, a side view of a portion of the Propylaea, will cause the reader greatly to underestimate, I fear, the real magnificence of that impressive portal.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LA RUE VAN HOOK

Science and Civilization. Essays Arranged and Edited by F. S. Marvin. Oxford University Press (1923). Pp. 350. \$4.20.

The volume entitled Science and Civilization consists of lectures "given at the Sixth Unity History School held at Woodbrooke near Birmingham in August 1922" (Preface, 3). At the end of the volume we find an account of The Unity History Schools and the Unity Series. The first School was held in August, 1915, at Woodbrooke, "the social and educational settlement of the Society of Friends, some four miles out of Birmingham". The plan of the Schools had been formulated in the preceding August, at the time of the outbreak of the World War, for

... then was the time to turn one's thoughts to those still greater and more permanent forces which have built up the world-community of the present, imperfect as it is, but growing, as we hope, stronger in unity, and capable, as the event has proved, of surmounting even the most terrible shock which could at that time have been imagined....

Mr. Marvin planned historical studies along these lines. The subject of the First School was The Unity of Western Civilization. The papers read at this School, by F. S. Marvin, J. L. Myres, J. A. Smith, E. Barker, W. M. Geldart, A. J. Carlyle, L. T. Hobhouse, J. W. Headlam, Hartley Withers, C. Smith, C. Delisle Burns, J. A. Hobson, H. G. Wood, were published in a volume entitled The Unity of Western Civilization (Oxford University Press, Second Edition, 1922). The themes of succeeding Schools, which constituted also the titles of the volumes containing the papers, as follows: II. Progress and History (fifth impression, 1921); III. Recent Developments in European Thought

(third impression, 1921); IV. The Evolution of World-Peace (1921); V. Western Races and the World (1922).

In the first five Schools the problems connected with the Unity of Mankind were treated from "the synthetic and general point of view" (Preface, 3). In the papers in the volume before us for notice,

...it was thought well...to attempt a more analytical line of approach and to consider in some detail one of the leading threads which have tended progressively to bind humanity together in historic times. Science was obviously the first to select. This volume will, it is hoped, be followed by another dealing with Art from the same point of view....

Somehow, as I read what is said about science in this quotation, I cannot help thinking of the part that science has played in warfare, notably and most horribly in the World War. Its chief contribution there to the unity of mankind seemed, at one time, likely to consist in the annihilation of a large part of the race.

The volume contains the following papers:

I. The Beginnings of Science, J. L. Myres (7-42); II. Ancient Medicine, Charles Singer (43-71); III. Aspects of Biological and Geological Knowledge in Antiquity, Arthur Platt (72-86); IV. Greek Mathematics and Astronomy, J. L. E. Dreyer (87-111); V. The Dark Ages and the Dawn, Charles Singer (112-160); VI. The First Physical Synthesis, A. N. Whitehead (161-178); VII. Science in the Industrial Revolution, Cecil H. Desch (179-202); The Influence of Darwinism on Thought and Life, J. Arthur Thomson (203-220); IX. Science and Education, A. E. Heath (221-246); X. Science and Health, F. G. Crookshank (247-278); XI. Science and Religion, Julian S. Huxley (279-329); XII. Science and Human Affairs, F. S. Marvin (330-350).

There is no Index.

Manifestly, several of these papers are of interest to students of the Classics. The names of J. L. Myres, Arthur Platt, Charles Singer, A. E. Heath are sufficient guarantee of the scholarly character of the articles contributed by them to the volume.

CHARLES KNAPP

The Greek Commonwealth. Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens. Fourth Edition, Revised. By Alfred Zimmern. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1924). Pp. 471. \$5.35.

The Preface to the first edition of Mr. Alfred Zimmern's well-known book, *The Greek Commonwealth*, is dated in 1911. The Prefaces to the second, third, and fourth editions are dated December 2, 1914, March 20, 1921, and April, 1924.

In the second and the third edition Mr. Zimmern

had embodied in text and footnotes of his book the new material which he gathered as he kept abreast of the literature of the subject. With respect to the fourth edition he writes, in the brief Preface, as follows:

...But as the years go on I am carried farther and farther away...from the state of mind in which I wrote <the book>.... Experience in following up criticisms either of my general treatment or of special points has convinced me that I shall do the book, and my own earlier judgment, an injustice if I tamper with them too freely. On the other hand, it would obviously be foolish to ignore the recent literature and to allow the book to become stereotyped and out of date. I have therefore decided to leave the text unaltered except in a very few cases (such as the date of the Parthenon sculptures) where questions of ascertained fact are involved and to deal with the recent literature and considerations suggested by it in a separate Appendix....

I have also added an index of Greek words and phrases.

In the Appendix, which covers pages 445-451, Mr. Zimmern takes up various points, in the order of their occurrence in his book. Among the longer additions made here is a note, to page 27, dealing with the legendary character that, as the result of "Carthaginian mystifications", the Atlantic Ocean assumed for the Greeks of the classical period. Here the views of A. Schulten are of special importance. In connection with pages 110 and 113 there are fairly long notes on Spartan matters. A note relating to page 193 deals with Athenian coinage, on the basis of suggestions made by Mr. Percy Gardner. In connection with page 410 there is a reference to an article by an American scholar, Mr. W. B. Dinsmoor, of Columbia University, dealing with the building accounts of the structures on the Acropolis at Athens. Mr. Zimmern, however, takes issue sharply with Mr. Dinsmoor's views. In connection with page 411 Mr. Zimmern accepts the view set forth by a British scholar, Mr. A. M. Woodward, and by Mr. Dinsmoor, that

...the Parthenon sculptures, which it was generally thought were contemporaneous with the building itself, were being constructed from 439-438 to 433-432, when they were completed. As Pheidias <sic!> was in disgrace after 438 it seems probable therefore that he did not supervise their execution.

The last note in the Appendix relates to evidence which, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Mr. Woodward supplied from inscriptions to support Thucydides's account of Athenian dealings with Melos. Mr. Zimmern accepts Mr. Woodward's views, which clash with those of "Gardner" <which Gardner? Where was the view of "Gardner" set forth?>.

CHARLES KNAPP